

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **11 July 2006**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1, 3-15, and 17-28. Claims 1, 3-15, 17-28 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of non-statutory double patenting.

Rejections under non-statutory double patenting

Claims 1, 3-15, 17-28 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of non-statutory double patenting,


Applicant respectfully submits the attached terminal disclaimer and two certificates under 37 C.F.R. 3.73(b) to obviate any actual or provisional double patenting rejection.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 15 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-14, which depend upon claim 1, and claims 17-28, which depend upon claim 15, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 17 July 2006

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: edward@parklegal.com